



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/343,969	06/30/1999	STEVE BLUMENAU	E0295/7097	8523

7590 04/01/2003

ROBERT A SKRIVANEK JR
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS PC
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/343,969

Applicant(s)

BLUMENAU ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/13/03 have been fully considered but they are deemed moot in view of the new grounds of rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. US apatent 6,041,345 and further in view of Bormann et al. US patent 6,157,378 and Jacoby US patent 5,220,655.

As per claims 1, Chen teaches a storage system that is assessble by a plurality of user over a network. Chen teaches each user has access to different portion of data on the storage device [col.5 lines 5-30]. Chen does not teach a graphical user interface for administer the privileges and system that logged

Art Unit: 2153

in. Bormann teaches a method for simplifying maintenance of a system by providing a graphical user interface that displays representation of host processing systems that are logged into the system and displays the login information [see col.8 claim 1]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of Bormann et al. to Chen et al. because it would have provided an improved interface for management of the system.

Jacoby teaches a graphical method for monitoring and display connections to enable a user to visually monitor the network. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the network management method of Jacoby to the storage system of Chen because it would have provided intuitive, easy to comprehend way to monitor the storage system.

Jacoby teaches displaying connection paths and graphical representation of host processor [fig.3's] at various level of details. The various presentations of information and commands would have been apparent in the system as modified.

The reference does not teach displaying a graphical representation of a network card to graphically represent a host processor. It graphical image chosen to represent a host processor would clearly a matter of design choice because the

Art Unit: 2153

image choosen would not have affected the underlying function of the graphical user interface.

Claims 62-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. US patent 6,041,345 and further in view of IBM TDB No.NB9203306 "Graphical User Interface for Security Administration."

As per claims 62-85, Chen discloses method for changing access privileges to portion of data on a storage system over a network [fig.2, col.5 lines 5-15. Chen does not teach a graphical user inteface for displaying and enabling modification of the privileges in response to a graphical selection. The IBM TDB teaches providing a graphical user interface for security administration. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of the IBM TDB with Chen et al. because it would have improved the system by allowing the user to administer the system from a graphical user interface and prevented the user from having to know or remember commands or syntax to accomplish the task. It is apparent that the system as modified would have the steps of displaying graphical presentation and modifying of access privileges in response to selection of the graphical presentation.

Art Unit: 2153

The IBM TDB reference does not teach displaying a graphical representation of a network card to graphically represent a host processor. It graphical image chosen to represent a host processor would clearly a matter of design choice because the image choosen would not have affected the underlying function of the graphical user interface.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)
(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner